

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Numbers 11-16

11. There appears to be an inconsistency among sections of the RFP regarding the need for a FOCI determination. Section K-12 appears to invoke DEAR 952.204-73 unnecessarily. This is based on Section L.23 that specifically states: "Performance under the proposed contract does not involve access to classified material. " In addition Section M does not discuss the requirement or evaluation of FOCI and the need for a favorable FOCI determination. Will a facility clearance be required under this contract? Will a favorable FOCI determination be required, or should the K-12 clause be deleted?

Answer: The RFP, Section K.12, invokes DEAR 952.204-73 which requires a facility clearance and favorable Foreign Ownership, Control or Influence (FOCI) determination for contracts/subcontracts when employees are expected to have access authorizations (security clearances) which would seem to imply access to classified information. The scope of work covered by the RFP does not involve classified information; however, some protective force personnel (both prime and subcontractor) have access authorizations in order to maintain their armed Security Police Officer qualification. Therefore, the statement that the proposed contract does not involve access to classified material (Section L.23) is correct but not inconsistent with the requirement for a facility clearance and favorable FOCI determination as required by Section K.12. A facility clearance and favorable FOCI determination is a representation and certification requirement and is not part of the evaluation described in Section M of the solicitation. DOE will make the FOCI determination prior to award based upon the information submitted by Offerors per the Section K.12 requirements.

12. The RHWF is currently not operational due to equipment failures, are Offeror's to assume for the purpose of the proposal that the RHWF will be fully operational at the time of contract start? If not, please provide a list of systems that will not be functional.

Answer: For the purposes of proposal preparation, the Offeror should assume the Remote Handled Waste Facility (RHWF) will be operational at the time the contract is awarded.

SOLICITATION DE-RP30-06CC30000

13. In L.5(f)(9) the Projected Incumbent Employee Fringe Benefit Rates by Fiscal Year illustrate a decline in Fringe Benefit Rates over time. It is typical for these rates to remain constant or increase consistent with the rate of escalation. Please clarify that the declining rates provided are correct.

Answer: The projected incumbent employee fringe benefit rates by fiscal year are correct.

14. On Attachment L-6 List of Terminated Contracts, DOE has requested a list of terminated contracts for the Offeror(s). For Attachment L-6 is it DOE's desire that the Offeror provide a list of only those contracts terminated for cause or default? Please clarify.

Answer: The Offeror shall provide a list of all past contracts where the Offeror was the prime contractor and the contract was terminated for default. Section L will be amended to add this clarification.

15. The requirements for L.4(c) and (d) appear to overlap. Is it DOE's intent that for the Experience section that Offeror's describe their corporate capabilities and experience as they apply to the WVDP PWS in an all-inclusive more global manner, or is it DOE's desire to limit the discussion in the Experience section to only three projects and if so do the three projects discussed in Experience need to be the same three presented in Past Performance? Please clarify.

Answer: In the Experience section of proposals, Offeror's shall describe their corporate experience in performing relevant work similar to that described in the PWS by using information on experience gained from up to three contracts for the Offeror (if not a newly formed entity, such as a joint venture or LLC where it will be up to three contracts for each member) and up to three contracts for each major subcontractor. Limit the corporate experience discussion to the contract projects chosen for this information. The contracts used as the source of information for the Experience section can be, but do not have to be, the same contracts used for the Past Performance references required by Section L.4(d).

16. Will the Site Visit tour as described in L.26 utilize the same tour route and script used for the March 13-31 public tours? Will the touring officials be permitted to answer questions from the Offeror attendees or will the exchange only be one-way? Please advise.

Answer: The route of the Site Visit Tour (as described in L.26) will be the same as the March 13-31 public tours. However, there are differences in the script and the way the tour will be conducted. The main difference in the tour script (for the Site Visit Tour, as described in L.26) is that it is more detailed, such that it

SOLICITATION DE-RP30-06CC30000

contains building/room dimensions, building materials, etc. There are also minor content changes from the public tour script. The Site Visit Tour script should be considered the most up-to-date version. The conduct of the tour will be slightly different in that not all the information contained in the script will be read during the tour; only highlighted portions of the script. Since the script will be posted, it was seen as unnecessary to verbalize every detail in the script during the tour. The touring officials will not be permitted to answer questions from the Offeror attendees. Participants will be asked to provide questions in writing to wvdpseb@emcbc.doe.gov and responses will be posted at http://www.emcbc.doe.gov/wvdp_seb.